

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM No. M-4048 of 2016 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 02.05.2016

Navdeep Singh

--Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

--Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA.

Present:- Mr. A.K. Sama, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. D.S. Virk, A.A.G., Punjab.

TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA.J

This order shall dispose of the present petition filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C praying for the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case F.I.R. No.93 dated 2.9.2015 under sections 420, 465, 467, 468, 471, 506 I.P.C, registered at Police Station, Hathur, District Ludhiana.

On 4.2.2016, while issuing notice of motion, the following order was passed by this Court:-

“Counsel would inter alia contend that the allegations raised by the complainant i.e. Paramjit Kaur as regards taking forcible possession and selling of land admeasuring 4 biswas falling to the share of the complainant in inheritance, are totally unfounded and improbable. In this regard counsel contends that in the statement made by the complainant which has led to the registration of the F.I.R no details are forthcoming pertaining to the specific land holding. Further contended that the land that the petitioner has sold, falls within the Lal Dora and for which there would be no revenue record to show title. Petitioner is, otherwise, stated to be ready and willing to join investigation.

Notice of motion, returnable for 2.5.2016.

In the meanwhile, petitioner is directed to join investigation.

In the event of arrest, the petitioner shall be released on interim bail subject to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer/Investigating Officer. The petitioner shall join investigation as and when called upon to do so and he shall remain bound by the conditions envisaged under Section 438 (2) Cr.P.C.”

Learned State counsel upon instructions from ASI Parminder Singh would apprise the Court that the petitioner has since joined investigation and there is no recovery to be effected from him.

In the considered view of this Court, custodial interrogation of the petitioner, as such, would not be warranted. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed. The order dated 4.2.2016, passed by this Court, is made absolute.

Petition disposed of.

(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE

02.05.2016
lucky